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Abstract: Many researchers have concentrated on investigating factors that influence consumer purchasing behavior. As one of the factors, decision-making styles have received a significant amount of attention from consumer behavior researchers over the years. Understanding consumer decision-making styles is becoming more significant due to its inextricable relationship with shopping behavior. Previous studies considered decision-making styles as a personality trait which has a lasting effect on consumer decision making. Recently, some studies suggested that decision-making styles are influenced by product type and supported that decision-making styles are not consistent when used across contexts and decision situations. This paper argues that, although extensive effort has been made in investigating consumer decision making styles, relatively less attention has been invested in conceptualizations of decision-making styles and has failed to identify whether consumer decision-making styles are truly personality trait based or context dependent.
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I. INTRODUCTION

As one of the factors influencing consumers purchase behavior, decision-making styles are crucial for understanding consumer shopping behavior and for developing successful marketing strategies. Decision-making styles have been mainly viewed as a relatively enduring consumer personality that seldom changes even when applied to different goods and situations. Recently, a study showed that consumer decision-making styles are influenced by product type, suggesting that decision-making styles are individual response patterns in a specific decision context rather than personality trait based. Despite extensive research regarding consumer decision making styles, relatively little attention has been paid to identify whether consumer decision-making styles are truly personality trait based or context-dependent.

Identifying individual consumer decision-making styles has received a significant amount of attention from consumer behavior researchers and practitioners over the years due to the inextricable links to consumers’ purchase behavior (Mitchell & Bates, 1998). In particular, examining decision-making styles is important so that marketers and retailers are in a better position to understand the preferences and needs of different groups of consumers (Tai, 2005). Several studies have investigated consumer decision-making styles and revealed their importance to consumer behavior research (Hafstrom, Chae, & Chang, 1992; Durvasula et al., 1993; Lyonski, Durvasula, & Zotos, 1996; Mitchell & Bates, 1998; Fan & Xiao, 1998; Kamaruddin & Mokhlis, 2003; Bakewell & Mitchell, 2003; Mitchell & Walsh, 2004; Bauer et al., 2006).

Problem Statement and Objectives

In the consumer behavior literature, most studies assume that all consumers approach shopping with certain decision-making traits that combine to form a consumer’s decision-making styles (Walsh, Wayne-Mitchell, & Hennig-Thurau, 2001b). Sproles and Kendall (1986) suggested that decision-making styles are to be viewed as a relatively enduring consumer personality, analogous to the more general concept of personality in psychology. Sproles and Kendall (1986) suggested that decision-making styles are to be viewed as a relatively enduring consumer personality, analogous to the more general concept of personality in psychology. Namely, consumers adhere to a basic buying decision-making style even when applied to different goods and situations (Walsh, Hennig-Thurau, Wayne-Mitchell & Wiedmann, 2001a). However, Scott & Bruce (1995) argued that decision-making styles are more individual response patterns in a specific decision context rather than personality trait based. Recently, study showed that consumer decision-making styles are influenced by product type (Bauer, Sauer, & Becker, 2006) and supported the argument that decision-making styles are not stable personality traits. Although some researchers are aware that consumer may have different styles across product categories (Sproles & Kendall, 1986; Bauer et al., 2006), few studies provide clear evidence whether or not decision-making styles are influenced by contextual factors. Thus, the main purpose of this paper is to investigate whether consumer decision-making styles are context dependent.
II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview of Consumer Decision Behavior

To understand consumer purchasing motives, a brief review of the consumer decision process is needed. The literature on consumer decision theory asserts behavior is a series of processes where consumers select and use goods, services or ideas, citing five decision points as possible triggers for consumer purchase behavior (Alba, 1983; Assael, 1984; Blackwell, Miniard & Engel, 2001; Engel et al., 2000; Jennings & Wood, 1994; Jacoby, Johar & Morrin, 1998; Lapsley & Moulton, 2001; Reidick, 2003; Spawton, 1989, 1990, 1991):

1. Problem Recognition – the desire or need to purchase or consume something.
2. Information Search – the adequate need for information to resolve a problem or need.
3. Evaluation of Alternatives – the narrowing of alternatives to those that are preferable.
4. Choosing the Product - some consumers may skip the foregoing steps and rely on affect heuristics. In psychology, affect heuristics are simply a good feeling towards a situation (i.e. positive affect) that leads to a lower risk perception and a higher benefit perception, even when this is logically not warranted for the particular situation.
5. Post Purchase Evaluation – the evaluation of purchase made.

Figure 1 summarizes the five-stage model. However, it should be noted that this is an idealized model, rather than an explanatory model for every purchase (Darley, Blankson, & Luethge, 2010).

This means that although the model is widely accepted and used broadly in consumer decision studies, not all decisions will follow this approach (Darley et al., 2010). For example, routine purchases are more likely to be guided by habit with consumers buying products they have already established meet their needs (Lantos, 2010). Consumers may also stop evaluation of alternatives if it becomes clear that none of the existing alternatives is suitable, decide the need does not need to be filled, or find another way to fill their need (like borrowing, repurposing an existing item, or purchasing second-hand) (Kardes, Cronley, & Cline, 2010; Lantos, 2010). Thus, this model can only be taken as a general guide to the consumer decision and will not describe all decisions or all situations.

![Figure 1: The five-stage consumer decision model. Source: Adapted from Lantos (2010)](http://indusedu.org)
outside, or external to their memory (Assael, 1984; Bettman, 1979(a); Engel et al., 2000). Engel et al. (2000) outlined the following three factors that could impact the external search for information. First, there is the importance of the decision. When a decision is seen as having high personal importance, there is a degree of hesitancy to act without sufficient information. Second, the availability of information elsewhere. When the consumer knows that the information can be easily obtained from accessible external sources, there will be less internal search. Finally, the consumer’s confidence in their ability to make an acceptable choice in a particular circumstance. When consumers’ perceive significant differences between products, but are uncertain about which product is best for their needs, external search becomes more likely. That is, as the perceived risk of a purchase decision increases, so does the external search.

For quite some time now, consumer behavior researchers have been concerned with understanding how buyers use information in making choice decisions. Much of this work has been done in the areas of information processing (Alba & Hutchinson, 1987; Bettman, 1979(b); Bettman & Park, 1980; Rao & Monroe, 1988), information overload (Jacoby, Speller & Berning, 1974) and the resulting choice behavior (Hansen, 1972). These efforts addressed the way consumers process and handle information in forming attitudes and making purchase decisions. However, very few empirical investigations have been directed at understanding the sources of information sought by consumers or about the way different consumers seek information as a strategy for reducing perceived risk (Dodd, et al. 2005; Fodness & Murray, 1999; Gemunden, 1985; Newman & Staelin, 1972).

**Consumer Knowledge: Internal and External Search**

Consumer behavior models reflect knowledge as a variable influencing all phases of the decision process, particularly with information search (Beatty & Smith, 1987; Bennett & Mandell, 1969; Engel et al., 2000; Flynn & Goldsmith, 1999; Katona & Mueller, 1955; Moore & Lehmann, 1980; Newman & Staelin, 1972; Raju et al., 1995).

Research has also shown that product knowledge, in general, is directly related to many consumer behaviors. There are three distinct but related ways in which consumer knowledge is conceptualized and measured: past product experience, objective knowledge, and subjective knowledge; each discussed below (Brucks, 1985). Objective and subjective knowledge are categorized as the two elements of knowledge, while past product experience determines both (Dodd et al., 2005; Park et al., 1994; Raju et al., 1995).

**Past Product Experience (Internal Memory Search)**

To make decisions a person has to rely on acquired knowledge about the problem and on information gathered during the decision process. At the one extreme, decisions are based entirely on past product experiences. At the other extreme, the choice is based on exploring the environment. The relationship between buying knowledge or ‘expertise’ and information search behavior has received considerable attention in the consumer behavior literature (Alba, 1983; Jacoby, Chestnut & Fisher, 1978; Selnes & Troye, 1989).

The extent of prior experience with a product, some of which will be stored in memory, is an important determinant of subsequent information needs. For consumers to resolve their need to purchase or consume something, they must first look to past experience or memory of prior usage or consumption with a particular product.

This internal search of past experience strongly affects future expectations for the same consumption experience, particularly if a knowledge gap exists, by adjusting the amount and type of information needed when making choices (Alba & Hutchinson, 1983; Bettman, 1979; Bettman & Park, 1980; Brucks, 1985; Dodd et al., 2005; Jacoby et al., 1978; Williams, Schreayer, & Knopf, 1990). A knowledge gap is defined by Eng et al. (2000) as the absence of knowledge in memory. For example, the more information in memory, the greater the potential for internal search, and conversely, the less the need for external information. On the other hand, should the consumer have no experience with a particular product, and then internal search is by passed for external search. Knowledgeable consumers will process information and evaluate products differently, particularly when compared to novice consumers. These consumers have developed a strong knowledge structure about a product as they become more familiar with it and therefore, their preference for the product is likely to be well established and stable (Rao & Monroe, 1988; Kwun & Oh, 2006). However, as noted by Jacoby et al. (1978), the effect of prior information on external search may be less straightforward than previously thought. The absolute amount of information in memory may be less important as a determinant of search than the consumers’ perception of how knowledgeable they really are (Biehal, 1983).

According to Biehal (1983), a consumer may perform above average on an objective test of product knowledge, yet still engage heavily in external search if they feel ignorant or less confident about the subject, relying less on internal search if memory information is not perceived to be useful. On the other hand, the opposite may be true. A customer with below average objective product knowledge may feel very confident about the level of knowledge they have (high subjective knowledge) and rely on themselves to make the purchase decision.
Objective and Subjective Knowledge

Consumer knowledge is important both to theoretical models of consumer and to marketing practice. Consumer knowledge from past experience is an important construct in understanding consumer internal information search behavior (Brucks, 1985) and information processing behavior (Alba & Hutchinson, 1987; Bettman, 1979; Bettman & Park, 1980; Rao & Monroe, 1988).

Yet the impact of knowledge on decision making, and the measurement of this variable, has long been a subject in marketing literature. Bettman and Park (1980), Mattila and Wirtz (2001, 2002), and Park and Lessig (1981) identified two major approaches for measuring product familiarity: one measuring how much a person knows about the product (objective knowledge) and the other measuring how much a person thinks he/she knows about a product, or self-assessed knowledge (subjective knowledge).

Similarly, Brucks (1985) described three categories of consumer product class knowledge used in consumer behavior research: (a) subjective knowledge, the individual's perception of how much he/she knows; (b) objective knowledge, a measure what an individual actually knows; and (c) prior experience, the amount of purchasing or usage experience the consumer has with the product. However, according to Brucks (1985), experience-based measures of knowledge are less directly linked to behavior than objective and subjective knowledge.

Information is known to influence consumers’ purchasing behavior by the manner in which the information is presented and by the way it is perceived or processed by the consumer. Previous research by Biehal (1983), Dodd et al. (2005) and Park, Mothersbaugh & Feick (1994) found subjective knowledge does not accurately reflect objective knowledge and that subjective and objective knowledge have different effects on consumer behavior and information search and processing. For consumers, information is used to increase knowledge and reduce risk or minimize uncertainty. The buying decision is therefore guided by the extent to which various information elements are available and used by the consumer (Thomas & Pickering, 2003).

Differentiation between objective and subjective knowledge occurs when consumers do not precisely recognize how much or how little they actually know. Jacoby (1974) noted that what consumers' find important is not what is provided by the information source, but rather how the information is perceived and how it affects the consumer. Ruddell (1979) found that it is not the nature of the information, but rather its effects on the consumer, that impact consumer choices.

Perceived (subjective) knowledge was found to be negatively associated with the amount of information acquired by consumers making food purchase decisions, and measured knowledge (objective) was unrelated to information acquisition. This would impact consumer decisions, as those with higher self-assessed knowledge are less likely to seek out information about a product before coming to a decision (Ruddell, 1979).

Brucks (1985) noted that consumers with high levels of subjective knowledge may rule out alternatives they believe to be inferior and further suggested that subjective knowledge is related less to the number of attributes examined while objective knowledge is strongly related to information such as product attributes, the kind of impersonal information that is often found in advertising.

Park, Mothersbaugh, and Feick (1994) modeled self-assessed knowledge, using a structural model comparing the factors that influence objective and subjective knowledge. They found that 33% of the subjects' responses (self-rating of knowledge) were based on product information stored in memory, and 59% were based on product experience. Park et al. (1994) also compared objective to subjective knowledge and found that stored product information was more strongly related to objective knowledge, while product experience was more strongly related to self-assessed knowledge. Additionally, Park et al. (1994) found that a general level of self-confidence was not related to self-assessed knowledge.

Therefore, previous exposure to a product is based upon consumers past consumption actions. This creates the foundation that aids in the development of the consumers’ knowledge.

Decision-Making Styles

Decision-making styles are mainly viewed as a patterned, mental, and cognitive orientation towards shopping and purchasing, which constantly dominates the consumer’s choice, resulting in a relatively-enduring consumer personality (Sproles & Kendall, 1986). Some claim that it is the learned habitual response pattern exhibited by an individual when confronted with a decision situation (Scott & Bruce, 1995). The consumer literature suggests that decision-making styles can be categorized into three main approaches: the consumer typology approach (Darden & Ashton, 1974; Moschis, 1976), the psychographics/lifestyle approach (Lastovicka, 1982; Wells, 1975), and the consumer characteristics approach (Sproles & Kendall, 1986; Sproles & Sproles, 1990). The consumer typology approach attempts to define specific aspects of consumers’ shopping motives and attitudes by classifying consumers into a limited number of types, which differ from each other. On the other hand, the consumer characteristics approach focuses on cognitive and affective orientations that relate specifically to consumer decision-making. Psychographic research postulates that a consumer’s activity, interest and opinion statements can be very effective in measuring consumer personalities and predicting consumer behavior.
III. EXISTING STYLES

1. Perfectionist, high-quality conscious consumer
   This trait is characterized by a consumer who searches the very best quality in products. Those consumers higher in perfectionism could also be expected to shop more carefully, more systemically, or by comparison. Often, they are not satisfied with the good enough products.

2. Brand conscious consumer
   Those scoring high on this factor would be expected to buy expensive, well-known national brands, believing that the higher the price of a product, the better the quality. They also prefer best-selling, advertised brands. The consumers how display this style are likely to display some level of fashion consciousness.

3. Novelty, variety conscious consumer
   This factor characterizes novelty seekers, who find seeking out new things pleasurable. They are likely to gain excitement and pleasure from seeking out new things. Also, keeping up to date with styles, and being in style are important aspects of novelty and variety conscious consumers.

4. Price, value conscious consumer
   This factor measures price and value for money consciousness. People scoring high on this trait would be particularly conscious of sale prices and lower prices in general and, more importantly, are concerned with getting the best value for their money. These consumers are likely to be comparison shoppers.

5. Recreational, hedonistic consumer
   Consumers scoring high on this factor view shopping as recreation and entertainment. These consumers find shopping a pleasant activity and shop just for the fun of it. In previous research, this style was an opposite of the “shopping avider” or “time savor” trait.

6. Impulsive, careless consumer
   This trait describes people who tend to buy on the spur of the moment and to appear unconcerned about how much they spend or about getting best buys. That is, these consumers do not plan their shopping.

7. Confused by over-choice consumer
   This trait characterizes consumers who perceive that there are too many brands and stores from which to choose and who likely experience information overload in the market. High scores on this characteristic perceive many brands and stores from which to and have difficulty making choices.

8. Habitudinal, brand-loyal consumer
   People who have high scores on this factor have favorite brands and stores and have formed habits in choosing these repetitively. Habitual behavior is well-known aspect of consumer decision-making.

IV. PROPOSED ADDITIONAL STYLES

1. Fulfillment conscious consumer
   Fulfillment incorporates accuracy of service promises, having products in stock and delivering the product within the promised time (Zeithaml, Parasuraman, & Malhotra, 2002; Wang, 2003; Wolfinbarger & Gilly, 2003; Field, Heim, & Sinha, 2004).

   In reality, since service providers often have difficulty in controlling delivery quality as well as timing, fulfillment of product and service orders is a particularly troublesome area for not only online channels but also traditional channels. In particular, since in the case of online stores there is little real interaction between online consumers and the service provider, the consumer can be left feeling frustrated with the service fulfillment that they received. Thus, fulfillment is considered an important factor for online shopping. Similarly, Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988) already stated the importance of fulfillment in traditional stores as one aspect of service quality.

2. Incentive conscious consumer
   Many studies already pointed out that consumers are price sensitive, which has an effect on their decision-making (Kocas, 2003; Erdem, Mayhew, & Sun, 2001). In this study, the consumers who are likely to be more conscious not only of coupons, but also mileage programs, free gifts, cash back, sweepstakes, etc. are considered incentive consciousness shoppers.

3. Recommendation conscious consumer
   According to the theory of planned behavior (TPB) (Ajzen, 1991), an individual’s behavior can be explained by his or her behavioral intention, which is influenced by subjective norms. Subjective norms refer to an individual’s perceptions of other people’s opinions on whether or not he or she should perform a particular behavior.

   Previous study proposed dependent decision-maker, which is characterized by a search for advice and direction from others, as one of career decision-making styles (Harren, 1979). Scott and
Bruce (1995) also suggested it as a decision-making style, but it has received little attention from researchers of decision-making styles. The proposed eleven decision-making styles are displayed in Figure 2.

**Table 1:** Studies about Personal Factors (Culture, Age, Gender)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Survey instrument/Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sproles and Kendall (1986)</td>
<td>Presents a method for Measuring characteristics of consumer decision making styles</td>
<td>Consumer style inventory (CSI) and profile of consumer style is useful for consumer- interest professionals. Further application and validation of the CSI and PCS across population is encouraged.</td>
<td>501 high school students in US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sproles and Sproles (1990)</td>
<td>Explores the relationships between individuals’ learning styles and their consumer decision making styles</td>
<td>Statistically significant relationships are found between learning and decision-making characteristics</td>
<td>501 high school students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hafstrom, Chae, and Chung (1992)</td>
<td>Identify decision making styles of young consumers in Korea and to find if decision-making styles are similar for Korean and U.S. consumers</td>
<td>There was indication of the generality of several consumer decision-making styles of young U.S. and Korean consumers. The CSI has elements of construct validity and has potential use across international populations</td>
<td>Sproles and Kendall (1986) 310 college students in Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lysonski, Durvasula, and Zotos (1996)</td>
<td>Investigate the decision-making profiles of consumers in four diverse countries</td>
<td>CSI require additional psychometric work before it can be applied to other countries, particularly those that are less developed.</td>
<td>Sproles and Kendall (1986) 486 Undergraduate students from Greece,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell and Bates (1998)</td>
<td>Examines the generalisability of Sproles and Kendall's (1986) CSI in an extension of their work in the UK</td>
<td>Most of the original US traits were found in the UK, with the addition of new store-loyalty and time-energy saving traits. The CSI is sensitive enough to be able to assess cultural differences and produce sensible results.</td>
<td>India, New Zealand, and USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan and Xiao (1998)</td>
<td>Examine dimensions and profiles of consumer decision making styles of Chinese compared to other nations (American and Korean)</td>
<td>The consumer decision-making styles (brand, time, quality, price consciousness, and information utilization) are similar in the three countries but maturity of the consumer market may impact the differences in consumer decision-making styles</td>
<td>Sproles and Kendall (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mau (2000)</td>
<td>Examine cultural relevance of career decision-making style and career decision making self-efficacy</td>
<td>Career decision-making styles have differential impacts on career decision-making self-efficacy as a function of nationality and gender.</td>
<td>ACDM (Harren, 1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh, Hennig-Thurau, Mitchell, and Wiedmann (2001)</td>
<td>Examine the usefulness of the CSI for market segmentation using anon-students sample to improve the generalisability of the results</td>
<td>A seven-dimensional structure was found to be the most appropriate representation of a German decision making style. The current CSI seems unable to measure consumer decision making characteristics effectively in all countries.</td>
<td>Sproles and Kendall (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh, Wayne-Mitchell, and Hennig-Thurau (2001)</td>
<td>Test the generalizability of consumer decision making styles indifferent countries and with non-student German shoppers.</td>
<td>The eight factor model could not be confirmed but supported six factors of them.</td>
<td>Sproles and Kendall (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamaruddin and Mokhlis (2003)</td>
<td>Investigate how the process of consumer socialization will determine adolescents’ decision making styles</td>
<td>Significant relationships were found between social structural factors and socialization process, suggesting that the influence of socialization agent on adolescents may vary according to certain demographic characteristics</td>
<td>Sproles and Kendall (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi and Park (2003)</td>
<td>Explore cultural differences in decision-making styles of college students from five countries.</td>
<td>Culture may not be a stagnant phenomenon, and more variables should be explored to accurately evaluate cultural differences in decision-making styles.</td>
<td>Instrument was newly developed 815 college students of five countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher(s) &amp; Year</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickliffe (2004)</td>
<td>Examine the psychometric properties of a popular instrument used to measure consumer decision-making styles. The findings of this study were compared to previous studies.</td>
<td>The instrument is not a reliable or valid measure of decision-making styles in both Korea and the United States. New constructs (Confused impulsive consumer) were identified that those were in contrast with previous studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spicer and Sadler-Smith (2005)</td>
<td>Examine the psychometric properties and construct validity of the general decision making styles (GDMS) questionnaire in two UK samples.</td>
<td>Support the idea from Scott and Bruce’s (1995) development of the general decision-making styles (GDMS) instrument. No relationships with gender or year of study were observed. (rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai (2005)</td>
<td>Generate and create a typology of the shopping style dimensions of working female consumers between the ages of 18 and 44 in Shanghai and Hong Kong.</td>
<td>Identified ten shopping style dimensions relevant to the Chinese working females and the four new dimensions which are not found in the CSI include personal style consciousness, environment and health consciousness, reliance on mass media, and convenience and time Consciousness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakewell and Mitchell (2003)</td>
<td>Examine the decision making of adult female generation Y consumers.</td>
<td>Shoppers change as a function of their Generation membership because of macro environmental influences. Five meaningful and distinctive decision making groups: recreational quality seekers, recreational discount seekers, trend setting loyal, shopping and fashion uninterested, and confused time/money conserving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley, LeHew, and Woodside (2006)</td>
<td>How consumers’ decision-making styles relate to their shopping mall behavior and their global evaluations of shopping malls.</td>
<td>Support the existence of CDM styles among adult mall shoppers in different mall contexts. Gender is a prime antecedent associating with CDM styles. The influence of CDM styles on mall shopping consequences is subtle and indirectly influences activities during mall visits via influencing planned expenditure levels. CDM styles associate substantially with visitor satisfaction and with visiting shopping malls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spicer and Sadler-Smith (2005)</td>
<td>Examine the psychometric properties and construct validity of the general decision</td>
<td>Support the idea from Scott and Bruce’s (1995) development of the general decision-making styles (GDMS) instrument. No relationships with gender or year of study were observed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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making styles (GDMS) questionnaire in two UK samples


Thunholm (2004) Explore the relations between individual decision-making styles as measured by GDMS test and some mental abilities theoretically related to decision-making Decision-making style is not only reflective of habits and thinking practices as proposed in earlier Research. Decision-making style also involves basic self-evaluation and the general ability to initiate and maintain intentions (i.e. self-regulation) GDMS instrument (Scott and Bruce, 1995) 206 Swedish military officers

Loo (2000) Examine the psychometric properties of Scott and Bruce’s instrument The item and scale analysis support the construct validity of the Scott and Bruce’s work GDMS instrument (Scott and Bruce, 1995) 223 undergraduate students

Burns (2006) To relate individuals’ consumer decision making styles with their attitudes toward consumer free-riding activity Individuals with differing decision making styles possess varying attitudes toward consumer free riding. The origins of attitudes toward consumer free rising may be multifaceted Sproles and Kendall (1986) 1008 undergraduate students

Galotti, Ciner, Altenbauer, Geerts, Rupp, and Woulfe (2006) Investigate the relationships among individual difference variables, cognitive measures of performance; and affective reactions to, and descriptive ratings of, the decision making process There were significant relationships found between individual differences measures and affective reactions to, or descriptive ratings of, the decision making process. GDMS instrument (Scott and Bruce, 1995) 132 students

Table2: Studies about Non-Personal Factors (Product Type and Shopping Malls)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Survey instrument/Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott and Bruce (1995)</td>
<td>‘To develop a conceptually consistent and psychometrically sound measure of decision-making style’</td>
<td>The development of a measure of decision-making style that can be used across contexts and decision situations. Four decision styles postulated a priori from the literature emerged as independent styles in the military officer sample-rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant. In addition, a fifth style emerged, which was named spontaneous.</td>
<td>Bruce (1991) Sample 1-1441 male military officers, Sample 2- 84 MBA students, Sample 3- 229 upper-level undergraduate business students, Sample 4- 189 engineers and technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley, LeHew, and Woodside (2006)</td>
<td>How consumers’ decision-making styles relate to their shopping mall behavior and their global evaluations of shopping malls</td>
<td>Support the existence of CDM styles among adult mall shoppers in different mall contexts. The findings of this study showed that CDM styles are found to be independent in structure to different shopping contexts.</td>
<td>Sproles and Kendall (1986) 527 adult consumer in US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauer,</td>
<td>Analyze the relationship</td>
<td>Demonstrate that there is a</td>
<td>Sproles and Kendall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consumer behavior researchers have spent a great deal of time and energy to better understand the factors that influence consumer purchasing behavior. As one of the factors, decision-making style has received a significant amount of attention from consumer behavior researchers over the years. In the consumer behavior literature, most studies assume that all consumers approach shopping with certain decision-making traits that combine to form a consumer’s decision-making style (Walsh, Wayne-Mitchell, &Hennig-Thurau, 2001).

Previous studies have considered decision-making style as a personality trait with a lasting effect on consumer decision making (Sproles & Kendall, 1986). However, some studies have suggested that decision-making styles are influenced by product type (Bauer et al., 2006), and provide support for a study that asserted that decision-making styles are not consistent and can vary across contexts and decision situations (Scott &Bruce, 1995). This paper argued that, although consumer decision making styles have been investigated extensively, relatively little effort has been invested in conceptualizations of decision-making styles. Furthermore, research has so far failed to identify whether consumer decision-making styles are truly personality trait based or context-dependent. To clearly conceptualize decision-making styles, this paper challenged the theory that decision-making styles are personality trait based and investigated whether decision-making styles are influenced by contextual factors.

Limitation of study and suggestion for future research

This study has several limitations. One of them, the goal was not to describe a general population of consumers in terms of their decision-making styles, only one product category was utilized in this study to investigate whether consumer decision-making styles are independent from the channel context. Thus, more than one product category is recommended for future research. Retail and marketing managers may benefit from the results reported here. The findings suggest that individual decision makers may be flexible in terms of their decision-making styles in specific contexts. This implies that marketers need to understand their target consumers’ decision-making styles across context factors, to improve strategic marketing activities and effective communication to support consumer decisions. In addition, the findings indicate that marketers and retailers needs to continuously observe consumers’ decision-making styles and capture emerging new styles since this study shows that macro environmental changes in shopping environments might require changes to the developed dimensions. This kind of response is necessary not only for positioning or advertising products to intrigue consumers, but also for making adequate strategic and customer personalization to increase customer satisfaction regarding shopping for the company’s products and services.
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